

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 19 and 38 are independent claims. Claims 19 and 38 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

**Entry of Amendment After Final Rejection**

Entry of the Amendment is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 because the Amendment: a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; b) does not present any additional claims without canceling the corresponding number of final rejected claims; and/or c) places the application in better form for an appeal, if an appeal is necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1-15, 17-34, 36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,587,945 to Pasioka (hereinafter “Pasioka”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants submit that Pasioka does not teach or suggest each of the elements recited in claims 1-38. Independent claim 1, in part, recites “a memory configured to store electronic image data corresponding to an original document having an electronic, displayable verifiable provenance, and separately derived electronic displayable verification information corresponding to the provenance of at least part of the original document.”

Independent claim 19, in part, recites “creating electronic image data corresponding to an original document having an electronic, displayable verifiable provenance” and “providing electronic, displayable verification information corresponding to the provenance of at least part of the original document.”

Independent claim 38, in part, recites “wherein the electronic signal comprises electronic image data corresponding to an original document having an electronic, displayable verifiable provenance, and electronic, displayable verification information corresponding to the provenance of at least part of the original document.” Pasioka does not teach or suggest these features.

Pasieka fails to teach or suggest that the original document includes “an electronic, displayable verifiable provenance,” as recited in the pending claims. (underlining added) The Office Action cited Col. 4, lines 17-55 of Pasieka which discloses that an author uses an imager to create an image and the image is automatically sent to a server which signs and stores the image. In particular, this section of Pasieka discloses that the author operates an imager to create an image and initiates submitting the image to a secure server. The imager transmits the image to a secure server over a secure channel. According to Pasieka, preferably, the transmission will identify the author and the imager device. The server may return an image sequence number for the imager to facilitate later access to the image. The server combines the imager ID (or author ID) and image sequence number with the image to produce an image record and stores the image record. The server hashes the image record using a one-way hash to produce an image fingerprint. The server encrypts the image fingerprint using the server's private key (or author's or imager's private keys stored in the server) to form an image signature. The purpose of the encryption is to provide proof that the author is the originator of the image, and that the image has not been altered by others since it was signed. See at least Col. 4 of Pasieka.

The image signature of Pasieka does not correspond to the “electronic, displayable verifiable provenance,” as recited in the pending claims. In the “Response to Arguments” section, the Office Action indicated that a “provenance is defined as the origin or the source of something.” Therefore, the Office Action concluded that “an electronic, verifiable provenance would be an electronic or digital verifiable source.” Although Pasieka discloses an image signature, an author ID and the private key, there is no teaching or suggestion in Pasieka that any of these components is a part of an “original document,” as recited in the pending claims. There is also no teaching or suggestion in Pasieka that any of these components is “electronic, displayable verifiable provenance,” as recited in the pending claims. (underlining added) In other words, none of the image signature, author ID and private key of Pasieka is displayed in the image.

There is also no teaching or suggestion in Pasieka of “separately derived electronic displayable verification information corresponding to the provenance of at least part of the original document.” While Pasieka discloses that the image signature is derived separately, there

is no teaching or suggestion that the image signature is displayable in the image. In Pasioka, the image signature is not displayed in the image.

Therefore, Pasioka does not teach or suggest “an original document having an electronic, displayable verifiable provenance, and separately derived electronic displayable verification information corresponding to the provenance of at least part of the original document,” as recited in claim 1. As noted above, independent claims 19 and 38 recite similar features which are not taught or suggested in Pasioka. Each of claims 2-18 and 20-37 depends on and incorporates all of the elements of claims 1 and 19, in addition to the further elements recited in claims 2-18 and 20-37. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection of claims 1-15, 17-34, 36 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102 be withdrawn.

#### **Disclaimer**

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 27592-01057-US3 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: July 2, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Arlene P. Neal/  
Arlene P. Neal  
Registration No.: 43,828  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1875 Eye Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 331-7111  
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant